

THE ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE VETERANS  
TOWARD CHAPLAINS IN SERVICE

Charles F. Warnath '47

A Senior Thesis submitted to  
the Department of Psychology  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the degree of Bachelor of Arts  
Princeton University      Princeton, New Jersey  
January, 1949

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the presentation of a report of this type, there are generally those who work behind the scenes and help the author in some way to get the bare idea to some final meaningful conclusion. This study is no exception. I should like to express my deep appreciation to those who gave of their time and effort to assist me in working out the many problems which arose - to Dr. Leo P. Crespi of the Department of Psychology at Princeton University who suggested the topic and assisted in preparing the questionnaire; to Dr. George Horsley Smith also of the Department of Psychology at Princeton University who acted as my advisor and read over the manuscript; to Elizabeth Deyo of the Office of Public Opinion Research who was of inestimable help in giving me the technical advice necessary for interpreting and coding the raw test results; to Mary Lou Harrison for transcribing the coded answers to IBM cards; and to Margaret Lewis for the fine typing job on the finished report.

C.F.W.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION .....	1
	A. Reasons for the study .....	1
II	SAMPLE AND METHOD OF CONTACT .....	4
III	EXPLANATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES .....	7
	A. Explanation of Table Presentation and Accompanying Discussions .....	8
	B. Table A (Background Information) ...	10
	C. Presentation of Questionnaire Results .....	13
IV	QUESTION BREAKDOWNS .....	55
	A. Description.....	55
	B. Presentation of Breakdown Results ..	58
V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION .....	86
	A. Looking Forward .....	88
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	
	APPENDIX I	

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Reasons for the Study

To many of the religious-minded civilians during the war, the chaplain was the symbol of religious influence in the otherwise godless service organizations. There is little doubt that these people, upon hearing the oft-repeated phrase, "There are no atheists in foxholes", felt that the chaplains might be able to accomplish some great religious revival among the young American servicemen. This hope has already been dashed, for actual observations shows no mass movement of young veterans into the churches, and studies by Allport, Gillespie, and Young (1) along with those of Crespi and Shapleigh (2) have revealed that the greatest percentage of those college veterans studies were unaffected religiously by their war experiences.

If this be so, just where did the chaplain fit into the service picture and how was he received by the men? For many GI's he became the nebulous unseen individual in some office to whom the dissatisfied or unhappy man could go to have his "Sympathy Card" punched. In the minds of others it seems, if we take Allport's study of college veterans' feelings as the criterion (1), the chaplain was often inept and unfitted for giving aid and on the whole quite ineffective. To this latter group may be added those who felt that the chaplain's rank served as a restraint to close contact and mutual understanding with the main section of his "parishioners" - the enlisted men. This point of view is aptly stated by R. C. Kennedy (3), who points out the undeniable fact that many enlisted

men actively hate all officers, thus creating a barrier to any approach. Under these circumstances the question is one of degree - how widespread was the feeling against the chaplain as an officer and did the fact that they were officers repel enough men to seriously handicap the chaplain in carrying out his duties?

When the "duties" of the chaplain come up for discussion, several possible queries follow naturally. In those cases where the chaplain was placed in charge of recreation, what did the men think of the arrangement? When the chaplain was the official counsellor, did the men feel he was equipped to do a good job? And finally, when the chaplain gave a sermon or talked on sex and morals, how effective was he? It is necessary to think of the first two areas not only from the standpoint of those who actually experienced the chaplains at work in these areas but also from the point of view of the feelings of those men who may have an opposition to or strong reasons for the chaplain's operating in these areas, even though they may have had no direct contact with the chaplains at work in the given areas. This is true in the field of recreation since some men may believe that the chaplain can not or will not provide the necessary outlets for relieving the tensions built up in the monotonous or dangerous service conditions and as a result prefer to seek their own recreation, thus defeating the purpose of organized recreation. This approach is also true in the field of counseling since some men may feel that the chaplain's training does not equip him to handle secular problems or that his religious temperament may predispose him to certain stereotyped solution to problems; therefore, when a problem arises they avoid taking it to the chaplain and in

so doing may settle on a poorer solution than the chaplain may have been able to offer. On the other hand, in order to balance the ledger, we must take into consideration those arguments in favor of the chaplain's being placed in charge of those areas, for it may be true that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages in chaplain-headed recreation or chaplain counseling.

These are the main questions which this survey attempted to answer by means of the questionnaire approach. In addition, the questionnaire was set up to tap the feelings of the men on a few related points such as chaplain morale, inter-faith cooperation, and training improvements for chaplains.

The difficulties inherent in such a survey should immediately become apparent. Should only those men who had had close contact with the chaplains have been interviewed, a strong pro-religion bias would probably have occurred since, of course, the more religious are more apt to have had closer contact with the representatives of religion than any others. On the other hand, should the subjects include those men with little or no contact then there arises then there arises the possibility for a heavy "no opinion" or "no contact" vote on many of the questions. The author chose the latter approach as the lesser of two evils and decided to rely on decisive differences or marked trends in the answers of those who did answer. It turned out that answers to a number of the questions failed to break or trend decisively so that with a strong "no opinion" vote, nothing conclusive can be stated on these questions or their subsequent breaks.

## CHAPTER II

### SAMPLE AND METHOD OF CONTACT

The subject of this study were 326 veterans enrolled at Princeton University. The sample was obtained in a random manner by checking off every third man on the alphabetical list filed in the Princeton University Veterans' Office. The number was reached on the basis of two criteria: the belief that a sample of over 300 of the approximately 1100 veterans on campus selected in a random manner would be a fair representation of the entire veteran population of the University, and the belief that any large number in excess of 300 would make the study too unwieldy for one man to handle. In all, 385 names were checked off.

The subjects were contacted personally so that the questionnaire and its purpose might be explained. This was deemed necessary because of the fact that the questionnaire, being quite long and based on a non-ego involved subject, would not receive the necessary attention unless the interviewer could arouse a certain amount of interest and answer any questions which might arise, thus the percentage of returns could be increased. The questionnaire was then left with the man to be answered at his leisure and called for after two or three days. In this procedure certain complications arose. These complications were due primarily to the inability of the interviewer to contact the subject. Since both interviewer and subject were students, class schedules, sports practices, weekends, and study habits made contact with some men impossible. When several calls had been made to a room, roommates of the subject were pressed into service in an effort to get the questionnaire and explanation to the man.

This procedure generally resulted in an inferior return, for roommates were prone to make only a half-hearted effort in seeing to it that the questionnaire got into the subject's hands or else, as the interviewer discovered in a number of cases where the subject was finally contacted, the roommate had given little, if any, explanation. A few men refused to answer the questionnaire because of the amount of school work which they had to do and several others were no longer in the University. All in all, 58 men who originally appeared on the list could not be contacted. These men were widely dispersed throughout the alphabetical list and were not concentrated in any one dormitory, so it may be that their influence on the results was unimportant.

The questionnaires were distributed and collected throughout the month of October 1948; and, as has already been pointed out, the normal time between distribution and collection was two or three days.

The interest shown in the questionnaire was truly remarkable, considering the fact that the work of the chaplains was not a current problem to any of the men nor a problem in which the men were emotionally involved at the time. Many of those questioned expressed great interest in the results of the study and most of them took the time to answer each question fully - even to the extent of giving a reason why they had no opinion on a particular question. Naturally, in using a Princeton University group as the sample, certain limitations are placed on any survey, for unless the results are corroborated for groups outside the University they can generally be held typical of Princeton University alone or a sub group of the University. For this survey, it goes without saying that the educa-



tional level of the sample is higher than that of the general veteran population and in addition there is a heavier weighting of Protestants than would be true of the veteran group as a whole. There is also a possibility that the married veterans in the sample do not have the influence that they would have if the entire veteran population were questioned. However, it is possible that the results which were obtained do not differ widely from those which could be obtained from many other groups of college veterans.

### CHAPTER III

#### EXPLANATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

The main body of the questionnaire contains fifteen questions of the free answer type, twelve of which are preceded by a filter question or set of filter questions to screen out those men with no experience on the subject of that question. In addition, nine general background questions and a set of five military background questions were used in order to give an indication of the type of veterans questioned; these required only single-check or one word answers.

The questions were coded for punching on IBM cards by the author. At this point the validity of results on the free answer part of the questions could be debated since, as in any case of one-man coding, a certain amount of subjectivity was introduced. When no clear or concise answer was presented, some meaning had to be given to the material on hand which would fit it into the established code. Since no check was made by a second person, the original coder's interpretation must necessarily be accepted. However, because of the nature of the questionnaire, this procedure was felt to be superior to an attempt to foresee possible answers and giving only those possibilities to the subject in the form of a check-list.

The coded answers, after being punched and verified by a qualified IBM operator, were then sorted and percentaged; after this, breaks were made of each of the main items against all background questions in addition to breaking a few of the key questions in the body of the questionnaire against one another.

Upon analysis of the data it quickly became apparent that in a number of the questions certain individual categories were too small to allow unequivocal interpretation of the cross-tabulation results. Moreover, as had been anticipated, the number of "no opinion" or "no experience" answers to most of the questions was quite large and emphasized the point that only certain cautious statements might be made concerning any break or trend, no matter how marked it might be. These two facts coupled with the possibility for misinterpretation of some of the free answers during coding, have led the author to rely primarily on presentation of the data obtained on the questionnaire without breakdowns and embellished only with a few notes of interest. In addition, a few of the breakdowns which do reveal certain clear-cut data have been included along with remarks as to what the data may imply.

#### Explanation of Table Presentation and Accompanying Discussions

Each table on the following pages of this chapter gives the results on the individual question appearing at the head of that table. Each table also includes the results to any sub questions or a compilation of any comments which may have been asked for under the main question. Although the question on Tables 5, 11, and 13 had no short check-off answers, short-answer summary results were computed from the comments given. For instance, on Table 5, the percentage of men having "favorable", "unfavorable", or "no opinion" views on the question was computed from the general comments given in the discussion part of the question.

The results of each question are given in percentages; the N at the head of each column of percentage figures is the number of men upon which the percentages of that column are based. Columns in which the numbers add up to over one-hundred percent contain double answers - one or more men has given more than one of the replies appearing in the comment column.

Following each table is a short discussion of the results of that question. Only the striking features of that table are mentioned in the discussion. No attempt has been made to gloss over the number of "no opinion" on any question; and, consequently, where this number is high, percentages are pointed out for interest value and not as conclusive evidence for or against any possibility which they may imply.

The full questionnaire in its original form appears at the end of this report in Appendix I. The background information which follows the main questions on the questionnaire itself have been presented first in this write-up as Table A for the convenience of the reader, since his first interest will probably be in the men who answered the questionnaire.

TABLE A

Background Information

1. Religious affiliation:

Catholic	10%
Protestant	76
Jewish	4
Other	3
None	6
No answer	<u>1</u>
	100%

2. Sect, type, or point of view - other than Catholic:

Presbyterian	23%
Methodist	3
Lutheran	2
Episcopalian	32
Reform Judaism	2
Agnostic & Atheist	7
Miscellaneous	9
No answer	<u>22</u>
	100%

3. Estimation of religious strength:

Very strongly	3%
Strongly	10
Moderately	35
Not very strongly	20
Not at all strongly	29
No answer	<u>3</u>
	100%

4. Age:

20 and under	5%
21 through 24	88
25 and over	6
No answer	<u>1</u>
	100%

5. Area of greatest scholastic interest:

Physical or bio- logical sciences	32%
Social sciences	46
Humanities or the languages	20
No answer	<u>2</u>
	100%

TABLE A (Cont'd)

6. Current or anticipated field of study:

Psychology or Sociology	12%
Public and International Affairs	5
Economics	17
Politics or Law	8
Medicine, Chemistry, or Biology	8
Languages (including English)	10
Engineering or Archi- tecture	18
History	12
Miscellaneous	5
No answer	5
	<u>100%</u>

7. Status in the University:

Freshman	0%
Sophomore	8
Junior	38
Senior	53
No answer	1
	<u>100%</u>

8. Group average last term: (First group highest)

First & second group	45%
Third group	44
Fourth and fifth group	10
No answer	1
	<u>100%</u>

9. Marital status:

Married	7%
Single	92
No answer	1

10. Military status:

a)	Officer	12%
	Enlisted man	87
	No answer	1
b)	Army	45%
	Navy and Coast Guard	38
	Marine Corps	5
	Air Force	11
	No answer	1

TABLE A (Cont'd)

c)	Overseas service	67%
	USA Service only	32
	No answer	1
d)	Combat	29%
	No combat	69
	No answer	2

TABLE I

Presentation of Questionnaire Results

From your experience in the service, what in general is your opinion of the work of the chaplains - favorable or unfavorable - and why?

	<u>N - 326</u>	
Generally favorable	(a) 68%	
Generally unfavorable	(b) 9	diff. a-b (59%)*
No opinion	23	
	<u>100%</u>	

Comment in detail:

Favorable Replies: N - 204

Maintained morale	10%
Actually aided	20
Tried sincerely to help	20
Psychologically helpful	23
Most human element in service	5
Did their job efficiently	17
Qualified generally favorable	4
Little or no direct contact	12
Miscellaneous	3
	<u>114%</u>

Unfavorable Replies: N - 27

Not much help	30%
Rank conscious	7
Too dependent on cliches	7
Attitudes hypocritical	7
Sectarian prejudices	7
Mediocre men	22
Many stayed in rear areas	7
Little or no contact	7
Miscellaneous	19
	<u>113%</u>

\*Starred difference significant at the .99 probability level



This question is perhaps the key question of the entire survey, not only because of the decisiveness of the results but because it is the question where the subject can sum up all the good features about the work of the chaplains in his mind, subtract all the bad features, and come up with some over-all result. In this case, the overwhelming majority of men feel that the chaplains have done a worthwhile job or probably more important, a very small percentage (only 9%) look on the work of the chaplains with disfavor. This is very interesting when one considers that 29% of the men questioned have given themselves the lowest possible ranking on the "strength of religion" scale. It seems to be a case of these men having a "live and let live" attitude - the chaplain may be of little use to them, but he does perform a useful function for some of the boys. This is born out in the breakdowns where the highest percentage of favorable replies - 23% - note that the chaplain performs a psychological service in being present to strengthen the religious men. Twenty per cent of the favorable replies show that the chaplains which these men have in mind actually performed some helpful act or acts. Another 20% of the men commenting favorably on the chaplains do not mention specific things which the chaplain accomplished but do maintain that the chaplain at least was eager to help, even if he was unable to accomplish the given task.

On the other hand, 30% of those who comment unfavorably on the work of the chaplains do so because of some specific thing which a chaplain was unable to do for them. Another 22% of those with an unfavorable attitude are included to that attitude because of the social misfits and other mediocre men which the service attracted to the chaplaincy.

All in all, however, the striking thing to be noted in the results of this question is the low degree of actual hostility toward the work of

the chaplains. This is one thing which the question would certainly have shown. Any grievance against a single chaplain would have very likely been generalized to include the entire corps and caused a swing towards an unfavorable attitude - this did occur in 30% of the replies which were unfavorable as shown by the fact that the reason given for an unfavorable attitude was a specific job which one chaplain was unable to do for the particular man. If this be the case, it can probably be stated that, except for a small minority, those chaplains with whom the men in this survey came in contact, if they did nothing else, at least did nothing to gain the ill-will of those around them.

TABLE 2

How frequently, if ever, during your period in service did you consult with a chaplain on any of your problems?

	<u>N - 326</u>
Frequently	1%
Occasionally	7
Once or twice	21
Never	<u>71</u>
	100%
a) If you consulted any chaplain, he was generally of what faith?	
	<u>N - 93</u>
Catholic	25%
Protestant	72
Jewish	2
Don't know	<u>1</u>
	100%
b) In general do you feel that the counseling you received was adequate?	
	<u>N - 93</u>
Yes	(a) 74%
No	(b) 16 dif. a-B (58%)*
No opinion	<u>10</u>
	100%
Favorable comments:	
	<u>N - 69</u>
Active assistance	15%
Gave routine advice	33
Was in favorable position to help	6
No opinion	<u>46</u>
	100%
Unfavorable comments:	
	<u>N - 15</u>
Unable to give help	20%
Cold approach	20
Miscellaneous	20
No opinion	<u>40</u>
	100%

\*Starred difference significant at .99 probability level

Little could actually have been expected on this question since the sample of this survey included men who would have been least likely to go to the chaplain for counseling. The great majority of these men are from the higher economic levels - thus being less likely to have financial difficulties; all have a higher level of intelligence and education than the average GI - thus being less prone to carry small troubles to someone else; very few are married - making them less susceptible to family problems; and only a small percentage are Catholics who would carry their difficulties to a priest as a matter of course.

As can be seen, only 8% of the entire group ever visited a chaplain for counseling more than once or twice, while 21% did visit a chaplain on one or two occasions. Of these men, the great majority (74%) felt the chaplain's counsel was adequate, although 33% of this group note that the counsel given was only routine advice and involved no special or complicated procedure on the part of the chaplain. Only 16% of those counseled felt that the counsel received was inadequate, but no one reason was given prominence for the failure of the chaplain - except that the counsel was of no help in 20% of the cases and in another 20% the men resented the chaplain's cold and impersonal approach.

TABLE 3

For advice in the personal problems you encountered in service would you rather have gone to a chaplain or to a person like a psychologist?

	<u>N - 326</u>
Chaplain	34%
Other person	32
No opinion	34
	<u>100%</u>

Why do you have this preference? Please answer in detail.

Comments on chaplain preference -	<u>N - 112</u>
Chaplain more practical	8%
Greater influence of chaplain	5
Chaplain more sympathetic;	
psychologists too scientific	38
Don't trust psychology	11
Psychologist a professional	4
Problem involved not psychological	14
Miscellaneous	12
No opinion	10
	<u>102%</u>

Comments on preference for other person -	<u>N - 104</u>
Lack of rapport	7%
Specific training	34
Religious training biases	
advice	23
General agnostic position	5
Depends on problem	10
Miscellaneous	15
No opinion	10
	<u>100%</u>

Reasons for no opinion -	<u>N - 99</u>
Depends on problem	20%
Depends on man	5
Want no outside help	12
Should have both	4
Miscellaneous	2
No answer	57
	<u>100%</u>

It had been hoped, on this question, to draw the entire group into a reply, but the wording of the question evidently did not make the problem hypothetical enough so that a sizeable number of the men refused to commit themselves. Many of this group mentioned in the space for comment that they had never had a personal problem in the service and so had never had reason to go to either a chaplain or another person - missing the point of the question completely - whom they would rather have gone to if they had had a problem.

Nevertheless, of the 66% of the men who answered this question, a strong 49% showed a preference for someone other than a chaplain when a personal problem arose. As might be expected, the main reason given for this preference was the belief that the chaplain did not have enough specific training in solving personal problems to entrust the solution to his hands; the other reason of any importance was the belief that, because of his religious training, the chaplain would be biased certain stereotyped solutions and therefore make a solution worthless for many men without a strong religious background.

Of those who felt that they would rather have gone to a chaplain, 38% gave the rather interesting reply that to them a chaplain appeared to be a more sympathetic individual than a person like a psychologist whom they thought prone to look on a man with a problem as a scientific experiment. Another 14% of these men relied on personal experience to explain that problems which they had encountered were not psychological, and, therefore, they preferred the help of a chaplain. Still another 11% stated flatly that they did not trust psychology or psychologists.

Since a large number of the men who checked "no opinion" gave reasons for their doing so, it was considered of interest to present these reasons. It will be noted that 20% of this group felt that the man to whom they went with a problem would depend entirely upon the type of problem involved; another 5% stated that it would depend on the man; while 12% showed their complete independence by going on record as capable of solving all of their own problems without any outside help.

This question is of interest probably more from the standpoint of the reasons given for holding a particular view than anything else. There is a definite balance of the specific training problem and mistrust of a religious background as preparation for counseling on one side against the mistrust of psychology and a feeling that psychologists are too coldly scientific on the other. In any case, the strength of arguments and percentages of the sample on both sides, added to those who did not answer because they felt the type of problem and character of the man are determining factors in deciding to whom one should go with a problem leads to the belief that both a trained secular counselor and a chaplain should be available to the men. The split is so evenly balanced and the reasons for preferences on both sides so diametrically opposed that no other answer seems possible.

TABLE 4

From your observations of chaplains do you feel that their counsel to service men in regard to their personal problems was realistic or unrealistic in the main as you understand these terms.

	<u>N - 326</u>	
Realistic	(a)	39%
Unrealistic	(b)	13
No opinion		48
		<u>100%</u>
		dif a-b (26%)*

Please Explain:

Reasons given for believing counsel realistic -

	<u>N - 128</u>
Helpful <u>approach</u> on	
personal problems	20%
Practical <u>solution</u>	
to problems	13
Service conditions	
necessitated practical	
solutions	14
No moralization	12
Qualified answers	6
Miscellaneous	10
No answer	25
	<u>100%</u>

Reasons given for believing counsel unrealistic -

	<u>N - 43</u>
Any religious approach	
is unrealistic	58%
No definite solution	
to problem given	19
Miscellaneous	11
No opinion	12
	<u>100%</u>

\*Starred difference significant at .99 probability level



The large "no opinion" on this question casts some doubt on whatever may be said concerning the results. One difficulty which arose was, as might be expected, the meaning of the terms "realistic" and "unrealistic" is ambiguous, or rather left to the interpretation of the subject, and a number of the men balked at the prospect of having to make a decision before being able to give an answer. As a consequence, these subjects found it easier to check "no opinion" and write "I don't know what you mean" than to think the problem through.

However, it is still apparent that of those who did answer three times as many felt that the counsel of the chaplains was realistic as felt that it was unrealistic. Over one-third of the entire sample (39%) believed the chaplain's counsel to be realistic. In the reasons given for this view, a slight differentiation was made between a "helpful approach" to a problem and a "practical solution". The former was coded so by the author when no solution to a problem was mentioned specifically - although one may have occurred; the latter was coded when the subject mentioned specifically that the chaplain had done something of an active nature and carried through a problem past the "helpful approach" stage to a successful completion. Thirty-three per cent of the men believing the chaplain's counsel to be realistic presented these two reasons. Fourteen per cent of the group felt that the chaplain had no choice but to be realistic; these men believed that war conditions forced the issue and that should a chaplain give unrealistic advice he would soon fall into disfavor with the men and be forced home.

Of those who believed that the chaplain's counsel was unrealistic, 58% held the dogmatic view that any religious approach is unrealistic, assuming in their answers that the chaplain was not able to give counsel except in a religious context. Nineteen per cent presented concrete cases of chaplains' having been unable to give a definite solution to some problem.

In both groups there was a fairly large percentage of men (25% of those in the former and 12% of the latter) who seemed to hold their beliefs with no substantial basis, for these men gave no explanation for feeling the chaplains to be realistic or unrealistic.

TABLE 5

During your period in the service have you heard any sermons that were given by the chaplains?

N - 326

Yes	87%
No	<u>13</u>
	100%

If yes, what briefly is your evaluation of these sermons?

N - 285

Favorable	49%
Unfavorable	46
No opinion	<u>5</u>
	100%

Favorable replies -

N - 139

To the point	11%
Sincere	4
Generally good	29
Adequate	9
Gave spiritual lift	6
Same as civilian sermons	16
Adopted for servicemen	13
Depended on man and denomination	<u>12</u>
	100%

Unfavorable replies -

N - 130

Poor to average	24%
No inspiration	32
Poor subjects	14
Directed to least educated of group	11
Bible pounding	11
Miscellaneous	<u>8</u>
	100%

Considering the length of time that had elapsed between any sermons which the men had heard in service and the presentation of this question, it is surprising that the response was as good as it was. Of the 87% of the sample which had heard sermons in the service only 5% failed to give any reply when asked to evaluate them.

One striking thing to be noted in the results is the high percentage of men with an unfavorable attitude toward these sermons (46%). Although a large number of this unfavorable group (24%) gave little information as to why he held such an opinion, stating simply that the sermons were poor or just average, 32% did point out that the sermons gave meagre food for thought and hence were of little inspirational value. Eleven per cent were disturbed by the fact that the sermons were leveled at the least educated of any group and, as several men pointed out, often approached the Sunday School type of presentation. Closely related to this is the argument of another 11% that the sermons often degenerated into Bible-pounding moralizations which servicemen, especially of the more highly educated group, are prone to frown upon.

To balance the scales are the 49% of those who had heard sermons and held a favorable attitude toward them; however, as with the unfavorable group, there was a large percentage of these (29%) who could give no specific reason for holding their opinion. In fact, in all of the replies given by those favorably inclined toward the sermons, very few gave any concrete reasons for the evaluation. Moreover, it often became very difficult to differentiate between the "just average" reply, with an unfavorable connotation, and the "adequate" or "same as civilian sermons"

reply hinting at a certain amount of good will toward the sermons. Evidently, the time which had elapsed since hearing the sermons had caused many of the subjects to lose their complete assurance for holding a particular view and modified any strong feeling that they may have had; in other words, both groups tended to approach a more or less neutral position and several readings often had to be made of the evaluation presented before it became clear just what side of the fence the subject was on.

In any case, the percentage split on this question was very close. It must be remembered, however, that the reasons given by 22% of these subjects for being unfavorable towards the sermons - "directed to least educated of group", and the so-called "Bible-pounding" would not be so objectionable to a less educated or more fundamentalist group. This should certainly be taken into consideration in estimating the reaction of a representative sample of servicemen toward chaplains sermons.

TABLE 6

Considering specifically your experience with chaplains during your period in service, do you think that your contacts resulted in your being

	<u>N - 326</u>
More religious	12%
Less religious	5
Unaffected one way or the other	60
No experience with chaplains	22
No opinion	<u>1</u>
	100%

Why briefly?

"More religious" replies -

	<u>N - 38</u>
Re-awakening of religious feeling	24%
By example of chaplain	21
Superficially, by more frequent chapel attendance	18
Natural religious growth	8
Through religious instruction	13
Miscellaneous	13
No opinion	<u>3</u>
	100%

"Less religious" replies -

	<u>N - 16</u>
Religion inadequate under war conditions	38%
Chaplain poor example	25
Miscellaneous	31
No opinion	<u>6</u>
	100%

"Unaffected" replies -

	<u>N - 198</u>
Religion not based on personalities	5%
Talks by chaplains not spiritually uplifting	5
Opinions formed before contacts	17
Contacts of non-religious nature	8

TABLE 6 (Cont'd)

Too few contacts	23%
Chaplains not outstanding	6
Miscellaneous	3
No opinion	<u>33</u>
	100%

The results of this question are not too extraordinary considering the findings of Allport (1) and Crespi (2). In the two previous studies of college veterans, the great majority of men (54.5% in the former and 53.3% in the latter) pointed out that their religiosity was not affected by their war experiences. This particular question differed from those asked in the other investigations insofar as it attempted to select one factor of "war experience" - the contact with chaplains - and to determine the effect of this alone upon religious feeling. There was an expected drop in the percentage of men who felt this phase of war experience had affected them one way or the other from those who felt affected by war experiences as a whole, as presented in the other surveys. Of 266 men answering Allport's questionnaire, 26.3% declared that they had become more religious while 19.2% stated that they had become less religious. Crespi, using a sample of 199, found 25.1% feeling that they had become more religious and 18.6% that they had become less religious. Only 12% of the 326 men in this study believed that contact with chaplains had made them more religious and a mere 5% held the belief that these contacts had made them less religious. The added category which did not appear on the previous surveys - "No experience with chaplains" - was chosen by 22% of the men.

Since only a small percentage of the sample felt affected in one way or another by contact with chaplains, it would be foolish to make any dogmatic assertions in regard to the reasons given for the effect of these contacts upon the man. In this case, the tables will be presented for what they are worth without embellishing them with any risky comments. As far as the table of results on the "Unaffected" replies is concerned, the reasons appearing are self-explanatory and little can be added to what is presented.



TABLE 7

Chaplains often gave talks on sex and morals to the command; did you ever hear any of these talks?

	<u>N - 326</u>
Yes	49.7%
No	50.0
No answer	.3
	<u>100.0%</u>

If yes, do you feel that the chaplain dealt adequately with the problems involved?

	<u>N - 162</u>
Yes	39%
No	50
No opinion	11
	<u>100%</u>

Comment briefly -

"Adequate responses -	<u>N - 63</u>
Realistic approach	33%
From the religious point of view	30
Strengthened moral precepts	11
Miscellaneous	5
No opinion	21
	<u>100%</u>

"Inadequate" responses -	<u>N - 81</u>
Uninformed	10%
Religion did not offer solution under conditions	16
Moral arguments not adequate	27
Did not face issue squarely	35
Miscellaneous	7
No opinion	5
	<u>100%</u>

The results of this question show, for the first time on the questionnaire, a decided opposition to one phase of the chaplain's work. Previously, though a fair percentage has looked with disfavor on some aspect of the chaplain's work, a greater percentage has been favorable. In this case, however, of those who had heard talks by the chaplain on sex and morals, one-half felt that these talks were inadequate; and, in addition, 30% of those who stated that the chaplains handled the problem adequately did so with the reservation that it could only be considered adequate from the religious man's point of view. Moreover, it should be pointed out that a number of the men who noted that the chaplains used a "Realistic approach" mentioned specific instances where chaplains, according to these men, had seen that they could accomplish little under the circumstances and had simply advised moderation and personal hygiene.

Those who condemned the work of the chaplains in this field seemed much more aggressive than the supporters of this phase of the chaplains' duties. Thirty-five per cent of the group stated flatly that chaplains did not face the issue squarely, and another 43% gave the related arguments that neither moral nor religious precepts could accomplish much under the conditions which prevailed. It would not be out of order to say that the strength of opposition, as gauged by the intensity of answers, is stronger, in this question than any other; and for the first time in the opposition replies there appear traces of actual ridicule of and resentment toward the chaplain's efforts. The general tenor of replies given by most of the men who believed the chaplains' talks to be inadequate was, "He should have known

he couldn't hold back the physical drives of men who had the feeling that perhaps they would never again have the opportunity to experience those drives; he only made himself sound foolish." The real praise that appeared in the answers was for the chaplains who saw the futility of their position and simply warned the boys to be careful. Genuine contempt was voiced for those chaplains who preached total abstinence.

TABLE 8

From your observations of chaplains of different faiths during your period in service, do you think that their actions in regards to one another tended to foster religious unity or religious differences?

	<u>N - 326</u>	
Fostered religious unity	(a)	38%
Fostered religious differences	(b)	5 dif a-b (33%)*
No opinion		<u>57</u> 100%

\*Starred difference significant at .99 probability level

This was a shot-in-the-dark question and the bullet didn't quite hit the bullseye. Although 38% of the men held that religious unity had been fostered by the chaplains and only 5% felt religious differences resulted, 57% of the men refused to answer or threw up their hands and declared that they hadn't observed the chaplains of different faiths closely enough to have formed an opinion.

The men were asked to comment on the reason they believed as they did, but nothing of an unusual nature was said by any of them. Many different versions were given of the same themes - the subject either felt that since the chaplains were working for the same boss and using the same facilities, they threw away sectarian prejudices for their period of service, thus fostering religious unity, or they were the type of men who couldn't forget civilian quarrels and merely carried them over into the service, thus fostering religious differences.

Very, very few men contributed actual cases to support their views as they did on other questions. Most of those who did have an opinion seemed simply to choose the conclusion which seemed most logical to them and then explain the conclusion by working back through some sort of integrated argument. It would almost seem that the most honest men on this question, with a few exceptions, were those who refused to answer, saying that they had not observed the chaplains of different faiths closely enough.

TABLE 9

In the Navy the chaplain was generally placed in charge of recreational functions. Do you think this is a good idea?

N - 326

Good idea	34%
Not a good idea	26
No opinion	40
	<u>100%</u>

Why? Please answer in detail here.

"Good idea" replies -

N - 110

Eased approach to chaplain	28%
Helped chaplain to understand men	15
Chaplain had the time	10
Cared more for wants and needs of men than most officers	21
Part of morale job of chaplain	12
Miscellaneous	9
No opinion	9
	<u>100%</u>

"Not good idea" replies -

Prefer specially trained recreational officer	26%
Religious duties enough	6
Chaplain's idea of recreation not always men's	29
Miscellaneous	20
No opinion	19
	<u>100%</u>

Just why so many men refused to express an opinion on this is hard to say; it may have been a case of the problem's not being hypothetical enough. A large number of "no opinion" men defended their lack of opinion by saying that they had never seen a chaplain in charge of recreation and so were unable to evaluate the system's merits or shortcomings.

Since there was such a large percentage which remained an unknown quantity, we cannot accept the percentages of those who did take a stand with anything approaching finality. It is apparent, however, that, of this sample, just over one-quarter vigorously opposed the chaplain's controlling recreational functions and close to one-third of this group did so on the basis of the belief that the chaplain will differ from his men in his ideas of what constitute the best recreation for the troops. There was a general fear that the men would have to keep themselves constantly in check while taking part in any activities planned by the chaplain, thus being prevented from alleviating the normal service tensions.

Just over one-third of the sample supported the role of chaplains in recreational planning. The largest percentage (28%) held that if the men could see the chaplain acting in the informal situation of taking part in the recreation, they would feel freer to approach him with problems. Of course, this presumes that the chaplain will be young enough and vigorous enough to compete on an almost equal basis with the GI's. It is interesting to note also that 21% of those feeling that the chaplain should be placed in charge of recreational functions gave the reason for their opinion as their belief that the chaplain would care more for the needs of the men than most junior officers who might be given the job of recreational officer as just another duty.

Should these results hold true for the entire veteran or GI population it would probably be wise for the policy-makers of the Navy and its chaplaincy, if the practice of chaplains as recreational officers is still widespread, to consider placing this duty on an individual selection basis; for although it would seem that the pros and cons of this argument are virtually irreconcilable and that no matter what policy was adopted one side would have to remain disappointed, this is not quite true. If a chaplain is young enough and broad-minded enough, he will not only make his approach to the men more easily by the planning of and the participating in recreation, but he can also virtually eliminate one of the biggest oppositions to his serving as recreation officer by giving the men just about all they want in the way of good recreation without offending his conscience. On the other hand, should the chaplain be physically unable to take part in the recreation of the men, the argument that his participation eases his approach to the GI's break down completely; and, if he should be a fundamentalist or of a narrow-minded bent, his recreational planning will naturally exclude those things which to him are sins but to the bored or tense GI are necessary components of recreation. This latter possibility can only lead to a disruption of planned recreation. If the recreational duty depended, not so much upon the fact that a man were simply a chaplain, but more upon the combination of his being a chaplain and his ability to mix easily with the men on a physical and intellectual level, then it is possible that his being placed in charge of recreation would give the command a conscientious recreation officer and also serve the purpose of putting the chaplain in an easily approachable position.



TABLE 10

From your experience with chaplains during the war, how do you feel their morale stood up under dangerous conditions?

N - 326

About the same as the average soldier	5%
Better than the average soldier	12
Not as well as the average soldier	1
No experience with chaplains under dangerous conditions	67
No opinion	<u>15</u>
	100%

Comment briefly

"Better than" replies -

N - 39

Inspired with their job	26%
Set an example of courage	26
Higher morale	26
Hearsay	2
No opinion	<u>20</u>
	100%

Not much of value came out of this question because the number of men who observed chaplains in dangerous conditions was very limited. Only four men of the entire sample had experiences which made them feel that the morale of the chaplains did not stand up so well as the average soldier and only one of these was actually referring to poor morale; the other three used the space provided for comment to vent their wrath on individual chaplains who stayed in rear areas or aboard ship when the troops went into battle.

Nearly three-quarters of the men who noted that the chaplain's morale was higher than the average gave specific instances of chaplain courage. One man, for instance, told of a paratroop chaplain who insisted upon jumping with the new men in order to give them courage, even though he himself had broken bones at one time or another, including his legs and back.

On the whole, however, this question was very unrewarding. In order to obtain worthwhile material from this query a good-sized sample restricted to those who had observed chaplains in dangerous conditions would have to be used.

TABLE 11

What effects, if any, do you think that the fact that the chaplain was an officer had upon his relationships with enlisted men?

	<u>N - 326</u>	
Good effect	(a)	23%
Bad effect	(b)	26
No effect	(c)	43
Depends on man		4
No opinion		4
		<u>100%</u>
"Good effect" replies -	<u>N - 75</u>	
Rank increased respect and prestige		75%
Gave court of appeals at officer level		5
Chaplain, as officer, better able to handle problems		15
Miscellaneous		<u>5</u>
		<u>100%</u>
"Bad effect" replies -	<u>N - 84</u>	
Made rapport difficult		100%

\*Starred difference significant at the .99 probability level

All but 4% of the sample had some comment on this question and far and away the highest percentage (43%) seemed to feel that the chaplain's rank had no effect upon his relationship with the enlisted men. A good many of these stated that the chaplain was looked upon merely as an "honorary" officer who made few of the usual demands of his rank on the enlisted men.

Four percent of the sample felt that the effect of the rank depended upon the individual chaplain, and the remaining 49% were pretty evenly divided between the belief that the rank had a good effect and the belief that the rank had a bad effect. Of the latter, every argument boiled down to pretty much the same thing - it was with some uneasiness that an enlisted man approached any officer and, when the approach had been made, it was often difficult to establish rapport. Of course, the chaplain by being a "good Joe" could often overcome the initial strained relations; but if the chaplain did not have the facility for talking his way into the confidence of the enlisted men, the initial barrier of rank could easily limit the chaplain's effectiveness.

Of those who felt that the chaplain's rank had a good effect upon his relationship with enlisted men, 75% gave as their reason the belief that rank brought with it increased respect and prestige - a necessary attribute for a man with the duties that fall to the chaplain. Another 20% of this group looked at the problem from the practical point of view - that, as an officer, the chaplain would be in a better position to handle the problems of the enlisted men and would give them a court of appeals at the officer level.

It is almost impossible to say which of the opposite groups has the most cogent arguments. It seems, however, that since 69% of the men either see no harm in the chaplain's being an officer, or actually believe the rank has certain merits, the present set-up is not working such a great hardship on the enlisted men that it should be viewed with alarm.

TABLE 12

From your experience, would you say that the chaplains of any one faith (Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish) appeared to be more able than the chaplains of any other?

<u>N - 326</u>		
Yes	(a)	14%
No	(b)	36
No opinion		50
		<u>100%</u>

diff. b-a (18%)\*\*

if yes,

A) Which do you consider more able?

<u>N - 45</u>		
Catholic	(a)	73%
Protestant	(b)	16
Jewish		9
Catholic & Protestants		2
		<u>100%</u>

diff. b-a (57%)\*

B) Why do you consider this to be true?

<u>N - 34</u>		
Catholic:		
Closer contacts with men		21%
More broad-minded		17
Better selection gave		
better men		32
Better training		21
No answer		9
		<u>100%</u>

\*\*Double starred difference significant at the .95 probability level

\*Starred difference significant at the .99 probability level

Half of the men in the sample felt qualified to answer this question. Of these, 36% could see no more ability in the chaplains of one faith than of another; but interestingly enough, of those who did see variations in ability almost three-quarters stated that the Catholic chaplains were superior - this from a sample made up of 76% Protestants. Naturally, when using the term "Protestant", a wide range of types is included, from the strict fundamentalists to the many liberal points of view; but the fact remains that more than four times as many men thought the Catholic more able than thought the Protestants more able. The reasons given by these men is perhaps indicative of the results - 32% pointed out that the Catholic Church could supervise the selection of its men much more closely than could the many Protestant denominations, and 21% noted that the Catholics were better trained in their religious duties than the average Protestant chaplain. Another 21% believed that since the Catholic chaplains stayed in close touch with the Catholic boys through the more or less compulsory confessions and masses, they had more insight into the GI's problems than did the Protestant chaplain who had very little hold on his men.

Little can be said about the percentages or reasons given of those who thought the Protestant or Jewish chaplains superior because the number of cases is too small.

The important thing to notice on the table is the very small percentage of men who thought the chaplains of one faith more able than the chaplains of any other and the relatively large number of this group that selected the chaplains of the Catholic faith.

TABLE 13

It has been said: "The effectiveness of the chaplain is far more closely related to his personality and his ability to win the affection of his men than to the per se fact that he is an ordained man of God" (4) - Comment briefly on this statement.

	<u>N - 326</u>	
Agree	(a) 85%	
Disagree	(b) 6	dif. a-b (79%)*
No opinion	9	
	<u>100%</u>	
Comments in agreement -	<u>N - 277</u>	
Better rapport	27%	
Personality important in solving problems	6	
Personality more important	13	
Individual differences	12	
Most problems non-religious in nature	6	
Agreed qualified	8	
Agreed, no comment	21	
Miscellaneous	7	
	<u>100%</u>	
Comments in disagreement -	<u>N - 20</u>	
GI goes to "Chaplain"	33%	
Needs personality too	14	
Personality due to fact he is ordained	19	
In religious problems, personality means little	10	
Miscellaneous	24	
	<u>100%</u>	

\*Starred difference significant at the .99 probability level



The overwhelming number of men seem to agree essentially with Wittels when he stated that "On the whole, the servicemen demand more of a preacher than that he be a preacher. If he is only a preacher, or is a sissy, or if they suspect him of being a hypocrite, or if he annoys them about petty things and narrow dogma, they will barely tolerate him; and sometimes they will be downright vicious toward him." (4, p.13) Not many of the men expressed a belief that the chaplain was in danger of open hostility from the troops if he happened to have a poor personality, but 27% of those who felt personality was of greater importance than the mere fact of ordination did believe that a chaplain, in order to do a good job, had to be able to approach and mix well with his boys. Another 12% pointed out contrasting cases where one chaplain had done a fine job and another had failed, simply because they had different personalities. Still another 12% noted that most of the problems which the chaplain handles in the service are not religious problems and that in order to accomplish their solution he must be more than a mere "preacher". It will be noticed that 12% of the men simply stated that "personality was more important". The reason for no explanation is that this question did not have a short single-check answer preceding the comment so that some men simply said, "I agree" in the comment space. They would have been "no comment" cases on the other questions.

Only 6% of the sample disagreed with the statement, and one-third of these men pointed out that the whole point of the chaplain's being in his position is the fact of his ordination - the GI does not go to any personable officer; he goes to the "Chaplain". Nineteen percent of this group felt that personality and the religious training which the chaplain has undergone are closely related, with the latter completely overshadowing the former. This also was the tack taken by most of those who agreed with

the statement but qualified their answer.

It appears, without any doubt, that most men evaluated the chaplain, not so much on the basis of what he could offer in the way of a formal religion, but what he could offer as an example of the type of man who could be looked up to, and at the same time, a man who could be easily approached and talked to. Since this seems to be the criterion of evaluation, the importance of close personality screening of the chaplains looms as the prime requisite in the selection of men to serve as chaplains. For the chaplain to be something other than a fifth wheel on the cart, the men have made it clear that he must be more than a certified seminary graduate.

TABLE 14

Generally speaking, what level of personnel do you think went into the chaplaincy during the war?

<u>N - 326</u>	
Persons superior to the general run of ministers and priests	(a) 16%
Persons inferior to the general run of ministers and priests	(b) 8
Persons about the same as the general run of ministers and priests	(c) 51
No opinion	25
	<u>100%</u>
dif. c-a (35%)*	
dif. c-b (43%)*	
Comment	
"Superior to" comments -	
<u>N - 51</u>	
Younger ministers more in tune with times	20%
Volunteer nature of job	20
Selection weeded out worst	8
Miscellaneous	9
No answer	43
	<u>100%</u>
"Inferior to" comments -	
Chaplaincy attracted social misfits	26%
Lack of experience due to youth	15
Miscellaneous	11
No answer	48
	<u>100%</u>

\*Starred differences significant at the .99 probability level

The most obvious thing which appears in these results is the large percentage of men (51%) who were able to discern no differences in the level of personnel in the chaplaincy from that in the civilian clergy. The main point made by this group was that the chaplaincy included the same range of good and bad that appear in any organization. Twenty four per cent of the sample could not agree with this view. Sixteen per cent feeling that the chaplains were generally superior to the average run of civilian ministers and 8% holding the opposite position. Of the former, 20% believed that the younger men which the chaplaincy attracted were superior to the general run of ministers because the attitudes which they held were more closely allied to the general tenor of the time. It is interesting to note that 15% of those who felt the chaplaincy attracted inferior men based their conclusion on the same age criterion; however, this group believed that youth meant inexperience and less ability to handle the problems which arose. Another comparison of note is the opposite views taken of the chaplain's enlistment motivation. To 20% of those who felt the chaplains of a superior type personnel, the very fact that the chaplains had volunteered was taken as proof of their higher ideals and stronger character than the average type which remained home; however, to 15% of those who felt the chaplains were of an inferior level of personnel did so on the premise that the chaplaincy offered a haven to many ministers, particularly of small country churches, who could not get ahead on their own merit in the civilian clergy. Both groups had a large percentage of men who gave no reason for their belief that the chaplaincy attracted either superior or inferior personnel. Just why <sup>is</sup> this is so difficult to determine with any accuracy.

All things considered, it seems that the chaplains appeared to most of the men much the same as the ministers with whom they had contact in

civilian life - enough poorer ones slipping through the selection procedure to give the chaplaincy a full range of types. Since no screening process can work with perfect efficiency, this is probably not a startling disclosure; that a number of poor men do slip through, however, indicates that the selection process can be improved.

TABLE 15

Considering in your estimation the strong and weak points of the work of the chaplains during the war, what would be your recommendations as to how their training might be improved?

	<u>N - 326</u>
Gave recommendations	57%
Did not answer	43%
	<u>100%</u>
Recommendations given -	<u>N - 187</u>
More careful selection for needs	26%
Participate more actively in GI training	26
Less emphasis on officer part on job	10
Remove chaplain from chain of command	3
More training in the social sciences	28
More specific training in recreational duties	3
Free chaplain from sectarian dogma	4
Chaplains did good job; no recommendations	12
Miscellaneous	<u>11</u>
	<u>123%</u>

Full participation on this question did not occur because a large number of the sample refused to answer without knowing of what the chaplains' training consisted. Of those who did give answers, some included activities following the training period - most of this material was dropped into the "Miscellaneous" category, except for the 10% who asked for less emphasis on the officer part of the chaplain's job and the 3% who wanted the chaplain removed from the chain of command. There is also a sizeable 26% which pointed out that the training was not so important as was the more careful selection of men, with the duties of the chaplaincy in mind during the screening. Many of this group referred back to question 13 and emphasized the need of bringing men of engaging personality into the Corps; others pointed out that chaplains should be physically equipped and mentally prepared for the eventuality of their entering combat zones. Somewhat related to this suggestion was that of the 26% who recommended that chaplains take a more active part in GI training with a two-fold purpose in mind. First, the chaplain would reach the physical and mental level required by those who are going to take part in an active shooting campaign (a phase of service life where chaplains become scarce, except to the rear with the wounded and dead, as several men noted), and secondly, the chaplain would identify and become identified with his unit - he could establish easy rapport with the men by being able to discuss intelligently, as a member of the in-group, any phase of the GI's life, weapons, duties, hardships, etc. According to a number of men, too many chaplains just didn't know what the GI's everyday life consisted of or what training he had been through and thus couldn't understand the point of view which these things engendered.

Twenty-eight of the replies advocated more training for the chaplains in the psychology and sociology of human relations - particularly those of the service. This is the theoretical end of the participation in GI training which has just been mentioned. It was felt that the chaplains should be thoroughly inculcated with the why's and how's of the servicemen's thinking and the problems of motivation in general so that the chaplain would not be forced into a naive reaction to some of the problems which were presented to him.

Four per cent of the replies suggested that the chaplain be taught to avoid sectarian dogma while in the service and 12% gave a pat on the back to the Chaplain's Corps by noting that it did a fine job and that no recommendations were in order.

That so many men made various suggestions for the improvement of the effectiveness of the chaplaincy is indicative of the fact that, at least with a sizeable group of veterans, a feeling exists that improvements can be made to improve the role of the chaplain in service life. The large percentage of men on this sample who imply that the chaplain very often does not understand the men with whom he is working points up a deficiency of some import. Little can be accomplished by the chaplain if he is a stranger to the intimate lives of those whom he is present to help. The GI wants more than a preacher or an official representative of the Church who can give him last rites - it seems, if the answers to this question are any indication, that he wants a friend in a position to help him with his problems who can understand him and have a real feeling for his needs.



## CHAPTER IV

### QUESTION BREAKDOWNS

#### Description

Breakdowns were made for each of the main items and their sub-questions against each of the background questions. The results were then analyzed and only those items selected for presentation which had the sharpest breaks or trends. Those breakdowns which showed fluctuations of only a few percentage points or in which the number of cases in the cells was too small to give the results any significance were omitted, except in one or two instances where a breakdown with little percentage fluctuation was included for contrast with some other items.

In order to give some of the background information more stability several categories were combined before the breakdown percentaging was done. In the "Religious Strength" question, the "very strongly" and "strongly" religious were combined in what might be termed an "above average" category; the "not very strongly" and the "not at all strongly" were combined in what might be termed the "below average" category; however, to avoid confusion, the original questionnaire terms have been used on the breakdown tables and joined with the word "or".

Since only three men on the sample were Coast Guardsmen, they were thrown in with the Navy; the Marine Corps and Air Forces groups were actually too small to bother with independently but were large enough to prevent their inclusion in the other groups since both of these groups have a different organization set-up from the Army and Navy, and there is some doubt that their members have the same point of view on many problems as have the members of either of the other two groups.

The age background data was practically useless because the bulk of the sample fell in the "21 through 24" group and left only seventeen and eighteen men in the "20 and under" and the "25 and over" groups respectively. It became apparent, after analyzing the breakdowns in which this information was involved, that the instability of the extreme groups made any interpretations based on this question extremely hazardous.

Another combination was made in the "Scholastic Interest" question for the sake of stability. The Physical Science and the Biological Science categories were felt close enough kin to permit them to be thrown together. The same thing was true of the Humanities and the Languages categories. Upon analysis of the data, it was found that on many of the questions the combining of these areas of interest made only one or two percentage points difference, but the size of the group after combination made the results much more trustworthy.

There was no doubt as to what should be done with the "University Status" groups. Almost all men at Princeton were back on a normal schedule so that odd-term men were quite rare. This permitted grouping of the men by years rather than terms - 2nd term Sophomores became merely Sophomores, etc. As might have been expected, no Freshmen were in the sample so that the status information was based only on three groups - Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors.

The background material on marks was also combined in an "above average", "average", and "below average" manner. The First and Second Groups made up the first of these; the Third remained "average"; and the Fourth and Fifth Groups, the last. As in the "Religious Strength" material appearing on the tables, the original terms remain in order to avoid confusion and are joined at the appropriate places by "or" to designate that the percentage appearing refers to the men in either one group or the other.

As far as "Marriage Status" is concerned, the background information offered very little. The number of "Engaged" men was very small and was put in with the "Single" groups; however, the number of "Married" men was also quite small so that only very large percentage differences on the breakdowns would have allowed for safe comment. No large percentage differences did occur, thus this particular item does not appear as a factor on any of the tables in this chapter.

Breakdowns were also made of several of the main questions against Question I to determine what effect general approval or disapproval of the chaplains' work had upon favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward specific duties which the chaplains had. Results of these breakdowns appear on Tables 25 and 26.

TABLE 16

Presentation of Breakdown Results

From your experiences in the service, what in general is your opinion of the work of the chaplains?

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION	GENERALLY FAVORABLE	GENERALLY UNFAVORABLE	NO OPINION
Catholic	85%	3%	12%
Protestant	70	8	22
Jewish	50	-	50
Other	89	11	-
None	24	29	47
RELIGIOUS STRENGTH			
Very strongly or strongly	79%	12%	9%
Moderately	81	6	13
Not very or not at all strongly	58	9	33
SCHOLASTIC INTEREST			
Physical or Biological Sciences	73%	4%	23%
Social Sciences	67	11	22
Humanities or the Lan- guages	67	11	22
GROUP AVERAGE			
1st or 2nd	64%	11%	25%
3rd	74	7	19
4th or 5th	69	3	28
MILITARY SERVICE			
Officer	87%	-	13%
Enlisted Man	67	10%	23

Probably the most interesting thing on this table, because of the sharp variation in percentages is the "Religious Strength" category. The least religious group tends to be least favorable toward the work of the chaplains; however, as a group, it is no more unfavorable than either of the others. The approximately 20% fewer people in the least religious section who are not favorable do not automatically become unfavorable, but rather tend to have no opinion. This occurrence may well be due to the possibility that these people had the least contact with chaplains and simply felt incapable of voicing an opinion; the rising "no opinion" from the most religious to least religious seems to emphasize this assumption. The same situation also arises in the "Religious Affiliation" category, although to a lesser extent - a smaller percentage of Protestants than Catholics is favorable toward the work of the chaplains, but the difference tends to drop into the "no opinion" rather than into the "unfavorable" column.

As far as "Scholastic Interest" is concerned, the men most interested in the Physical or Biological Sciences are more favorable toward the chaplains' work, and at the same time, less unfavorable than either of the other groups. The difference, however, is not great enough to allow an unqualified judgment.

The results appearing under "Group Average" indicate clearly the havoc which the "no opinion" can raise with the stability of the results. There is a definite trend toward a less unfavorable attitude as marks fall, but both the "favorable" and "no opinion" vote fluctuate with no apparent correlation between them and with no hint of an explanation.

The effect of military rank upon attitudes on this question is of interest because of the fact that not one officer who was questioned had a generally unfavorable attitude toward the chaplains. Officers were also

more favorable, but because of the possible effect of the "no opinion", a generalization would be extremely hazardous.

All in all it would seem that perhaps the religious strength of a man would incline him toward a more or less favorable attitude toward the chaplains, and the fact that he was a Catholic or an officer might make him more favorable, but outside of this it is probably that the attitude is pretty much a personal proposition, with the individual weighing the effects of the chaplains not only upon himself but also upon others (including those he feels are more religious than himself), tempering or intensifying the result with any personal experience he may have had with individual chaplains, and arriving at some conclusion.

TABLE 17

How frequently, if ever during your period in service did you consult with a chaplain on any of your problems?

RELIGIOUS STRENGTH	FREQUENTLY	OCCASIONALLY	ONCE OR TWICE	NEVER
Very strongly or strongly	-	14%	23%	63%
Moderately	1%	6	26	67
Not very or not at all strongly	1	6	16	77

SCHOLASTIC INTEREST

Physical or Biological Sciences	1%	10%	25%	64%
Social Sciences	1	7	16	76
Humanities or the Lan- guages	-	5	27	68

If you consulted any chaplain, do you feel that the counseling you received was adequate?

RELIGIOUS STRENGTH	YES	NO	NO OPINION
Very strongly or strongly	63%	25%	12%
Moderately	82	13	5
Not very or not at all strongly	71	16	13

GROUP  
AVERAGES

1st or 2nd	56%	28%	16%
3rd	90	8	2
4th or 5th	90	-	10

MILITARY SERVICE

Officer	66%	17%	17%
Enlisted Man	75	16	9
Overseas	75%	16%	9%
USA only	74	13	13
Combat	85%	12%	3%
No combat	71	17	12

This table can hardly be presented for more than its face value. The over-all number of men who ever went in to see a chaplain is almost too small to be broken into sub-groups with any hope of getting percentages which can be considered stable. The number of men who never went to see a chaplain quite naturally rises as strength of religion declines. The percentages of men who never visited a chaplain is also greater for men in the Social Sciences than in the Humanities, Languages, and Physical or Biological Sciences. It will be remembered that this latter group was the most favorably inclined toward the work of the chaplains in General.

Concerning the adequacy of chaplain counseling, since these percentages are based on only 92 cases (most of whom saw the chaplain only once or twice), no attempt will be made to interpret the results.



TABLE 18

For advice in the personal problems you encountered in service would you rather have gone to a chaplain or to a person like a psychologist?

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION	CHAPLAIN	OTHER PERSON	NO OPINION
Catholic	61%	15%	24%
Protestant	35	28	37
Jewish	8	67	25
Other	45	33	22
None	-	81	19
RELIGIOUS STRENGTH			
Very strongly or strongly	(a) 54%	9%	37%
Moderately	49	22	29
Not very or not at all strongly	(b) 19	46	35 dif. a-b (35%)**
SCHOLASTIC INTEREST			
Physical or Biological Sciences	39%)*	27%	34%
Social Sciences	28 )	37	35
Humanities or the Languages	43	30	27
STATUS			
Sophomore	56%	28%	16%
Junior	33	30	37
Senior	32	34	34
GROUP AVERAGE			
1st or 2nd	31%	38%	31%
3rd	37	28	35
4th or 5th	44	22	34

MILITARY SERVICE	CHAPLAIN	OTHER PERSON	NO OPINION
Overseas	34%	34%	32%
USA only	36	27	37
Combat	25%	41%	34%
No Combat	39	28	33

\*Differences of percentages noted by star are significant at the .95 probability level.

\*\* Differences of percentages noted by double star are significant at the .99 probability level.

Three significant differences were found on this table. It was felt to be reasonably safe computing these significances since the percentage of "no opinion" had a difference of only one or two percentage points. The assumption was made that these unknown quantities would virtually cancel out one another. The first of these significant differences is found in the "Scholastic Interest" category where 11% more of the men interested in the Physical or Biological Sciences would prefer to take their problems to a chaplain than would men interested in the Social Sciences. This percentage, except for a one point difference, holds up in reverse order for the "other person" preference, which is as might be expected. The second background area which shows a definite significance is the combat - non-combat section of the "Military Service" category where 14% less combat men would rather take a personal problem to a chaplain than would non-combat men, and 13% more combat men would rather take their personal problems to someone like a psychologist. The overseas - USA service section has been included as a contrast to these results. It can be seen that the overseas men split evenly in their preference for the chaplain or the other person, while 9% more USA service men prefer the chaplain to another person. The figures do not break sharply enough for a significant difference, but they do point up the fact that combat and not overseas duty seems to be the determining factor in deciding this preference.

An even greater significance is found in the "Religious Strength" category where the overwhelming preference of the above average group was for the chaplain and the exact opposite was true of the below average group which preferred another person.

The results of the remaining breaks are very much clouded by the "no opinion", but it might be pointed out that an overwhelming majority of Catholics prefer the counsel of a chaplain to that of another person as contrasted to the

Jews and non-religious groups where this was completely reversed, the latter group having not a single man who would rather go to the chaplain. No significance figures were computed for these differences since the number of cases is comparatively small, but a marked difference in opinion is certainly apparent.

Smaller percentage differences can also be noted in the "Status" and "Group Average" categories. In the former, the Sophomores show greater preference for chaplains than do the Juniors or Seniors. In the latter, there is a slight trend toward preference for chaplains' counsel as marks drop. In both cases, either the percentage difference or the number of cases in one of the cells is too small to permit the computation of significance figures.

This is undoubtedly one of the most clear-cut of the tables, for it shows definitely that those men with a combination of low religious strength, a Social Science interest, and participation in combat are most likely to prefer the counsel of someone other than a chaplain. Being strongly religious and a member of the Catholic Church seems to determine a preference for chaplain counseling poses a problem for those units in the service where chaplains are the only counselors on hand - especially in combat zones. If these results are any criterion of general feeling, a very large segment of any service unit is going to be very dissatisfied with the facilities for counseling which are offered through the chaplain. How religious most men in the average unit would rate themselves is a question, but on this sample more men rated themselves in the below average group than in the average and above average groups combined, and it was in this below average group where preference for counseling by someone other than a chaplain was the strongest. Certainly this fact has to be taken into account by service authorities before they can reasonably call the counseling services offered by the chaplain of any unit adequate.

TABLE 19

From your observations of the chaplains do you feel that their counsel to servicemen in regard to their personal problems was realistic or unrealistic in the main as you understand those terms.

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION	REALISTIC	UNREALISTIC	NO OPINION
Catholic	70%	3%	27%
Protestant	39	11	50
Jewish	8	17	65
Other	45	22	33
None	14	43	43
RELIGIOUS STRENGTH			
Very strongly or strongly	49%	5%	46%
Moderately	53	9	38
Not very or not at all strongly	21	19	54
SCHOLASTIC INTEREST			
Physical or Biological Sciences	47%	10%	43%
Social Sciences	35	15	50
Humanities or the Languages	39	15	46
STATUS			
Sophomore	52%	8%	40%
Junior	41	9	50
Senior	36	17	47
GROUP AVERAGE			
1st or 2nd	31%	18%	51%
3rd	45	10	45
4th or 5th	53	3	44

Again it must be admitted that the "no opinion" makes any interpretation of the data somewhat risky. Trends or differences are present on each of the background breaks appearing, but the differences are not large enough to overshadow the possibility that a shift of even a small part of the unknown "no opinion" on any break could completely swing the direction of the trend.

It seems safe to say that the results of the "Religious Affiliation" and "Religious Strength" are consistent with the results of previous tables, even taking the "no opinion" into account. In the former category, a greater percentage of Catholics see the chaplains' counsel as having been realistic than does that of any other group; in the latter, a smaller percentage of below average men feel the chaplains' counsel was realistic than either of the other groups. Strangely enough there is no piling up of this below average group on a feeling that the chaplains were unrealistic; rather the greatest number merely expressed no opinion.

TABLE 20

If you heard any sermons that were given by chaplains during your period of service, what evaluation of them?

	FAVORABLE	UNFAVORABLE	NO OPINION
RELIGIOUS STRENGTH			
Very strongly or strongly	41%	52%	7%
Moderately	53	34	13
Not very or not at all strongly	36	41	23
STATUS			
Sophomore	52%	24%	24%
Junior	36 )*	46	18
Senior	47 )	38	15
MILITARY SERVICE			
Officer	64%	28%	8%
Enlisted Man	41	41	18

\*Differences of percentages noted by star and significant at .95 probability level

Although sharp breaks were found in the "Religious Strength", "Status", and the rank section of the "Military Service" categories, actual significance figures could be computed with some assurance only on the break between Sophomores and Juniors of the "Status" category because of the ever-present "no opinion". On this particular item, the "no opinion" gave a difference of 11%. The Sophomore results were not considered completely reliable because of the small number of cases (25). It is apparent, however, that the Seniors of this sample were more favorable towards the chaplains' sermons than the Juniors - this at least is valid.

An interesting question is raised by the results in the "Religious Strength" category. It would seem that the two extremes of religious intensity differ from the more moderately religious men in their views on chaplains' sermons. Strangely enough a larger percentage (52%) of the above average group had an unfavorable attitude than had a favorable attitude (41%); in fact this percentage is higher than the percentage (41%) of the below average group which had an unfavorable attitude toward the sermons. Only those of average religious strength are inclined toward a generally favorable attitude. Why this is true is difficult to surmise. Even if the entire 7% of "no opinion" registered by the above average group had fallen in the "favorable" column, there would still be a majority unfavorable toward the sermons. In any event, it would require an analysis of what these men desired in a sermon and what was lacking in the chaplains' sermons which they heard to give a sound explanation; since such an analysis is not part of this study, the question will have to remain unanswered.

The officer - enlisted man differences on this question are only of general interest value because of the larger unfavorable percentage of enlisted men. Should the "no opinion" of both groups be included in either the "favorable" or "unfavorable" columns, the enlisted men would still be more generally unfavorable than the officers. Beyond this nothing can be stated with any certainty.



TABLE 21

Considering specifically your experiences with chaplains during your period in service, what was their effect upon your religious feeling?

RELIGIOUS STRENGTH	MORE RELIGIOUS	LESS RELIGIOUS	UNAF- FECTED	NO EXPERIENCE
Very strongly or strongly	26%	2%	53%	19%
Moderately	16	3	67	14
Not very or not at all strongly	6	7	58	29
SCHOLASTIC INTEREST				
Physical or Biological Sciences	15%	7%	59%	19%
Social Sciences	8	4	63	25
Humanities or the Lan- guages	15	5	58	22
MILITARY SERVICE				
Officer	10%	-	69%	21%
Enlisted Man	12	6%	60	22

So few men were affected one way or the other by contact with the chaplains that the results have little significance outside of the fact that the percentages follow the general pattern which has already been established on previous breakdowns. A greater percentage of the above average group in the "Religious Group" category seems to have become more religious than either of the other two groups, with the below average group having the smallest percentage. As might be expected, this latter group also reports a greater percentage of men having no experience with chaplains than either of the other groups.

Under the "Scholastic Interest" category, a smaller percentage of Social Science men was moved toward a more religious feeling than either of the other groups and also reported a greater percentage of "no experience".

The "Military Service" category has been recorded only to point out that all of the men on this sample who reported that they had become less religious through their contacts with chaplains were enlisted men, although this group also reported an insignificantly higher percentage of men who became more religious as compared with the officers.

TABLE 22

Chaplains often gave talks on sex and morals to the command; if you heard any of these talks, do you feel that the chaplain dealt adequately with the problems involved?

RELIGIOUS STRENGTH	YES	NO	NO OPINION
Very strongly or strongly	54%	46%	-
Moderately	41	43	16%
Not very or not at all strongly	36	58	6
STATUS			
Sophomore	73%	27%	-
Junior	37	52	11%
Senior	37	55	8
GROUP AVERAGE			
1st or 2nd	29%	65%	6%
3rd	57	30	13
4th or 5th	33	67	-
MILITARY SERVICE			
Overseas	43%	49%	8%
USA only	36	55	9
Combat	41%	50%	9%
No combat	41	51	8

"Religious Strength" shows the usual trend on this table with the belief that the chaplains' talks on sex and morals were adequate increasing as religious intensity increases. It is interesting to note, however, that even among the very religious men there was considerable feeling that the chaplains did not do an adequate job in this field.

The "Status" category was selected for presentation, not on its merit, but only on its interest value. This item presented without any explanation could be very misleading. It would seem that the less educated men tended to indorse overwhelmingly the chaplains' talks on sex and morals. This may well be true; however, nothing of the sort can be said to have been proved by these results since only 15 Sophomores are the basis of these figures. Because of the fact that the figures obtained on the Juniors and Seniors are almost identical, it can be assumed with some justification that education has little effect and that the percentages on the Sophomores are pretty much chance results.

The "Group Average" is another case similar to that of "Status". The two extremes - high and low marks - deviate markedly from the average group, - but since only 15 men are the basis of the percentages of the below average group, the results are almost certainly unreliable.

The "Military Service" items have been included to show the basis of a slight difference of opinion. Here it will be noticed that combat and non-combat men have almost identical opinions, but a slight 7% difference does show up between overseas and USA men, although this difference is not of a highly significant nature.

TABLE 23

From your observations of chaplains of different faiths during your period in service, do you think that their actions in regards to one another tended to foster religious unity or religious differences?

RELIGIOUS STRENGTH	UNITY	DIFFERENCES	NO OPINION
Very strongly or strongly	42%	5%	53%
Moderately	45	5	50
Not very or not at all strongly	30	5	65
 MILITARY SERVICE			
Officer	54%	-	46%
Enlisted Men	35	6%	59

Among those men who gave an opinion on this question a definite trend develops on the basis of religious strength. As religious intensity rises, the belief that the contact of chaplains of different faiths fostered religious unity also rises. The percentage difference does not drop, however, into a belief that the chaplains fostered differences, but rather into the "no opinion" column. Interestingly enough the percentage of each group that thought the chaplains' contacts fostered religious differences remained constant.

As can be noted by the data given on the "Military Service" breakdown, all of the men who felt that differences had been fostered by the actions of the chaplains of different faiths toward one another were enlisted men, and a somewhat larger percentage of officers than enlisted men thought religious unity resulted.

Other than these two categories, no trends or breaks could be noted.

TABLE 24

In the Navy the chaplain was generally placed in charge of recreational functions. Do you think this was a good idea?

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION	GOOD IDEA	NOT GOOD IDEA	NO OPINION
Catholic	24%	30%	46%
Protestant	36	25	39
Jewish	33	50	17
Other	45	10	45
None	10	28	62
RELIGIOUS STRENGTH			
Very strongly or strongly	51%	28%	21%
Moderately	35	26	39
Not very or not at all strongly	27	26	47
SCHOLASTIC INTEREST			
Physical or Biological Sciences	43%	20%	37%
Social Sciences	24	31	45
Humanities or the Languages	43	24	33
MILITARY SERVICE			
Army	25%	31%	44%
Navy and Coast Guard	45	20	35
Marine Corps	27	33	40
Air Forces	34	26	40
Overseas	33%	28%	39%
USA only	37	24	39
Combat	26% )*	30%	44%
No Combat	37 )	25	38

\*Starred differences of percentages indicates a significant at the .95 probability level.

Because of the rather large difference in the percentage of combat and non-combat men of the "Military Service" category who felt that placing the chaplain in charge of recreation was a good idea, the comparatively substantial number of men in each group, and the close split in the "no opinion", justification was felt for computing significance figures on this item. As will be noted, the difference did show a certain significance, thus allowing the assumption to be made that, in general, non-combat men tend more to favor the chaplain as a recreation officer than do combat men. When these groups are broken into overseas and USA service, the percentage difference decreases. It would seem, therefore, that participation in combat is a greater determiner of this attitude than the mere fact of overseas duty.

For the first time on any of these questions the branch of service seems to be a factor in attitude determination. Twenty per cent more of the Navy men than of Army men think that placing a chaplain in charge of recreation is a good idea. Unfortunately both groups have large "no opinion" elements and 9% more of the Army men than Navy men gave no answer. It thus becomes a problem of whether or not to eliminate the "no opinion". If it is eliminated the results are certainly significant at the .95 probability level. In a more cautious vein, no significance is claimed and the results presented only for what they are worth. It would seem, however, that Navy men, in general, are more favorable towards chaplains as recreation men than are Army men.

"Religious Strength" and "Scholastic Interest" results follow the pattern which has been laid down in the results of previous questions. A smaller percentage of below average men in religious intensity and of men interested in the Social Sciences felt that the placing of a chaplain in charge of recreation was a good idea than of either of the other groups in their respective categories. In both cases, the percentage of men opposed to

the chaplains as recreation officers is rather close for all groups; the differences in the "Good Idea" column have merely dropped into the "no opinion".

One of the interesting features of this table is the reluctance of the Catholics to back their chaplains as recreational officers. In fact, a greater percentage of the Catholics (30%) felt that such a set-up was a bad idea than felt it was a good idea (24%). Moreover, almost a half of the Catholics refused to commit themselves, showing a certain amount of evaluation of the problem from other than a purely religious viewpoint.



TABLE 25

From your experiences with chaplains during the war, how do you feel their morale stood up under dangerous conditions?

RELIGIOUS STRENGTH	SAME AS AVERAGE	BETTER THAN AVERAGE	NOT AS WELL AS AVERAGE
Very strongly or strongly	8%	84%	8%
Moderately	32	68	-
Not very or not at all strongly	35	54	11
SCHOLASTIC INTEREST			
Physical or Biological Sciences	39%	56%	5%
Social Sciences	28	62	10
Humanities or the Languages	15	85	-

Almost nothing can be said about this table because of the small number of men in any group - 29 is the highest number. It is simply of interest to point out the continuation of the already established pattern. Both the below average men in the "Religious Strength" category and those interested in the Social Sciences hold the most critical view of the chaplains. They both have the highest percentage of men in their respective categories who felt that chaplains' morale did not stand up as well as that of the average soldier, and the former group has the lowest percentage of men who felt that chaplains' morale stood up better than the average.

TABLE 26

What effect, if any, do you think that the fact that the chaplain was an officer had upon his relationships with enlisted men?

RELIGIOUS STRENGTH	GOOD EFFECT	BAD EFFECT	NO EFFECT	NO OPINION OR DEPENDS ON MAN
Very strongly or strongly	33%	26%	40%	1%
Moderately	23	22	43	12
Not very or not at all strongly	20	29	42	19
SCHOLASTIC INTEREST				
Physical or Biological Sciences	21%	25%	31%	23%
Social Sciences	23	25	41	11
Humanities or the Languages	26	30	38	6

This table shows a certain amount of agreement of the men in the "Religious Strength" and "Scholastic Interest" categories insofar as the percentages of each group within these classifications which felt that the chaplain's rank had no effect upon his relationship with enlisted men is concerned. Each group has approximately 40% who held this opinion, except for the Physical and Biological Sciences group which fell somewhat below, and this group had the largest percentage of "no opinion" and fence-straddlers.

The feeling that the chaplain's rank had a good effect upon his relationship with enlisted men trends downward as religious strength drops, and the least religious also have the highest percentage of men who felt that the rank had a bad effect.

Scholastic interest would seem to have had little or no effect on the attitudes determining the answer to this question. Slight percentage fluctuations are present, but the variable "no opinion" makes these figures unreliable.

What level of personnel do you think entered the chaplaincy?

What is your  
opinion of the  
work of the  
chaplains?

	SUPERIOR	INFERIOR	AVERAGE	NO OPINION
FAVORABLE	21%	5%)*	54%	20%
UNFAVORABLE	7	39	36	18
NO OPINION	3	4	49	44

How do you feel chaplains' morale stood up under dangerous conditions as compared to the average soldier?

What is your  
opinion of the  
work of the  
chaplains?

	ABOUT THE SAME	BETTER THAN	WORSE THAN	NO EXPERIENCE	NO OPINION
FAVORABLE	7%	16%	-	65%	12%
UNFAVORABLE	-	-	14%	72	14
NO OPINION	3	4	-	70	23

\*Starred differences of indicated percentages significant at the .99 probability level

TABLE 28

Do you feel chaplain counseling was realistic or unrealistic in the main?

What is your  
opinion of the  
work of the  
chaplains?

	REALISTIC	UNREALISTIC	NO OPINION
FAVORABLE	52%)*	6%)*	11%
UNFAVORABLE	14 )	54 )	17
NO OPINION	11	17	72

For advice in personal problems would you rather have gone to a chaplain or to a person like a psychologist?

What is your  
opinion of the  
work of the  
chaplains?

	CHAPLAIN	OTHER PERSON	NO OPINION
FAVORABLE	44%)*	25%)*	31%
UNFAVORABLE	18 )	54 )	28
NO OPINION	14	42	44

\*Starred differences of indicated percentages significant at the .99 probability level

Tables 27 and 28 give the breakdowns of two pairs of related main questions against the first question on the questionnaire, pertaining to general approval or disapproval of the work of the chaplains.

Table 27 is an attempt to determine what relation general approval or disapproval had to the more specific attitudes on level of personnel which entered the chaplaincy and the morale of chaplains under dangerous conditions. The results are very revealing for they indicate a marked difference in opinion. The men who were generally favorable toward the chaplains' work hold a decidedly better view of the chaplains on these two points than do the men who were unfavorable. Only 5% of the former believed that the chaplaincy attracted inferior men, while on the other hand, a small 7% of the latter felt that it attracted superior men. Similarly, not one of the favorable group felt that the chaplains' morale stood up worse than that of the average soldier while not one of the unfavorable group felt that it was about the same as that of the average soldier, much less superior to the morale of the average soldier.

Table 28 reveals an identical situation - only with more significant results. The men who were generally favorable towards the work of the chaplains believed overwhelmingly that chaplain counseling was realistic; by the same token, the great majority of the unfavorable group believed that the chaplains' counseling was unrealistic. It follows naturally that the former was much more disposed to prefer going to the chaplain for advice on personal problems while the very large majority of the latter showed preference for counseling by someone like a psychologist.

The results of these tables are very revealing, not only from the standpoint of showing the consistency of the men within the sample on their answers to questions about the various phases of the chaplains' duties, but also because

they reveal that in most cases the "no opinion" people tended to remain "no opinion" or "no experience" throughout most of the questionnaire. This is rather important in its effects upon interpretation of questions, for it would seem that the men with no opinion simply did not have the necessary contact with chaplains in these various areas to permit them to express an opinion. By remaining relatively constant, the "no opinion" loses some of its effect upon results. The answers given by the men with a definite opinion become a better indication of the opinion of men who did come in contact with the chaplains since the results lose some of the complications which arise when answers are not given by subjects in a sample who could answer, but don't.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It is apparent from the data which have been presented in this report that few non-debatable conclusions have been reached. Of the 326 Princeton University veterans questioned, almost seven out of ten were generally favorable toward the work of the chaplains. After this, however, decided differences of opinion occurred which, as the breakdowns seem to indicate, were based primarily on religious strength and scholastic interest and to a lesser extent on religious affiliation, participation in combat, and rank held during the service period. Unfortunately the sample was not large enough with the comparatively great number of "no opinion" continually involved to give a reasonable number of cases in each breakdown group. As a result, the background reasons for attitudes were difficult to ascertain with any degree of assurance.

The over-all results which were obtained from the unbroken main question do reveal certain interesting facts which can be enumerated:

1. Only 25% of the men interviewed ever went to a chaplain for counseling, but of this number, three-quarters felt the chaplains' counseling was adequate.
2. Almost one-third of the men would prefer to go to someone like a psychologist for counseling; on the other hand, just about the same percentage would prefer to go to a chaplain.
3. Three times as many men feel the chaplains' counseling was realistic as feel that it was unrealistic.
4. Of those men who heard sermons by chaplains, almost the same number were unfavorable toward the sermons as were favorable.
5. Very few men were affected religiously one way or the other by their contacts with chaplains; but, of those affected, over twice as many became more



religious as became less religious.

6. Half the men who heard talks by chaplains on sex and morals felt that these talks were inadequate; only 39% considered them adequate, and of this group, one-third thought them adequate only insofar as they gave the already known religious point of view on the question.

7. The majority of men who did give an opinion felt that religious unity had been fostered by the actions of chaplains of different faith toward one another; only 5% of the sample felt that religious differences had been fostered.

8. Just over one-third of the men felt that placing a chaplain in charge of recreation was a good idea; just over one-quarter opposed this setup. The biggest support of chaplain-directed recreation, as revealed in the breakdowns, came from the Navy men in whose organization the practice was most widely spread.

9. Only 1% of the sample felt that chaplains' morale did not stand up as well as that of the average soldier under dangerous conditions; 12% felt that it stood up better than the average.

10. Forty-three percent of the men believed that the chaplain's rank had no effect upon his relations with enlisted men; the remaining men split very closely on the merits of the chaplain's rank - 23% feeling that it had a good effect, 26% feeling that it had a bad effect.

11. Fourteen percent of the sample expressed the belief that the chaplains of one or the other of the faiths was superior to the rest. Of this group, almost three-quarters held that the Catholic chaplains showed superior ability in one form or another.

12. Only 6% of the men felt that the per se fact of the chaplain's being an ordained man of God was more important to his carrying out of his duties

effectively than was his personality and ability to win the affection of his men.

13. Just over one-half the sample felt that the chaplaincy attracted pretty much the average type of personnel; sixteen percent believed that persons superior to the general run of ministers and priests entered the chaplaincy, and only 8% were inclined to the belief that the chaplains were generally inferior to the general run of ministers and priests.

14. Almost six out of ten men gave suggestions for improving the selection and training of the chaplains. Over three-quarters of these suggested more careful selection for the duties which the chaplain must undertake outside of the strictly religious field, a greater participation on GI training (especially with the unit which the chaplain is to serve), and more instruction in psychology and sociology (particularly as related to the GI).

#### LOOKING FORWARD

This study should be considered as a pilot investigation rather than as a conclusive inquiry. The results can be taken only as an indication of the possible trends of opinion prevalent in the veteran or GI population at large; however, it certainly points up the need of more thorough investigation of the problems raised by these results. The services cannot hope for the highest possible morale among the men if the duties placed in the hands of the chaplain or the method of operation in the religious field itself by many chaplains is open to such strong and widespread criticism. The great majority of men who are generally favorable toward the work of the chaplains seems to indicate a feeling that the chaplain is certainly a necessary part of service life, but the fact remains that when pressed upon particular areas in which chaplains operate, many of these same men see the need for certain changes, whether it be relieving of the chaplain entirely from a particular duty or simply a more

particular selection for the duties to be performed followed by the intensive training necessary to help the chaplain carry out these duties to the better satisfaction and well-being of his men.

In any attempt at a more thorough study of the problem a number of questions would have to be answered first -- (1) Which population to test - present GI or veteran? (2) How to get a representative sample? (3) What to do about the large number of men who have had very little contact with the chaplains? and (4) What type of questionnaire to use?

Taking the first two questions together, I am inclined to believe that the answer to the second would determine the first. To obtain a representative sample of veterans seems to be very nearly an impossibility unless a large staff were used to check records and conduct interviews at widespread places. The interviewing of present GIs appears to be the more logical step. Representative samples could be easily obtained from each main foreign theatre of activities and various phases of USA activities (boot camp, advanced training, discharge areas, etc.) By this procedure, the value of the chaplain at each stage of the GI's service life could be appraised. Naturally follow-up surveys should be conducted to determine whether the results reflect attitudes toward chaplains in general or toward particular chaplains who may have had the duty at the time of the first survey.

The answer to the third question is a difficult one. As has been shown by the results of this survey, large numbers of men seemed to remain "no opinion" on almost all questions, evidently because their contact with the chaplains was limited. However, to eliminate all men who had little or no contact with the chaplains might well affect the results in a drastic manner. Those men who tend to have the greatest contact with the chaplains are those who are most likely to be the most religiously inclined and have the most generally pro-religious

viewpoint. But the chaplain is on hand not only for the benefit of the religious men, but also to give aid, in whatever manner he can, to the below average in religious intensity and to the agnostics and atheists too. If the opinions of these latter groups are overlooked simply because up until the time of the survey they have had little contact with chaplains, of what value is such a question as "Would you confidently entrust your personal problems to a chaplain?" There is little doubt that the men who have had the greatest previous contact will be the more religious men and will tend to say "Yes", but there is also a good chance that the least religious, who have probably had little or no previous contact and who may be the great majority of the population, will say "No". Of what benefit as a counselor is the chaplain to the population as a whole? With the vote of those who have had little contact eliminated, the conclusion may be that the chaplain is an adequate man for the job; if it is included, the conclusion may well be reversed. This being the case, the only fair and honest procedure seems to be to select the sample irregardless of the previous contact factor; however, the sample would have to be large enough to make the "no opinion" on any particular question relatively unimportant. Filter questions could be used to screen out the men on the main questions where good answers would require that the subject have considered first-hand knowledge of the subject. Filter questions could also be used to screen out the "no opinion" men in an effort to discover why they had no opinion; and if it were because of too little contact with chaplains, then an attempt could be made to find out why no contacts had occurred. Perhaps many religious men never see the chaplain, not through any fault of their own, but because the chaplain has spent his time sitting in an office waiting for the men to come to him when, for most men, the chaplain has to overcome the "Sympathy Card" stigma through certain active moves on his part that give the men confidence in him.

The subject of filter questions brings up the problem of questionnaire form. It is in this area that I feel my survey may prove to be of greatest value. Those questions on which confusion or misunderstanding occurred have been given special mention in the discussions. The open-end questions have also revealed general areas or types of answers given by most men so that it should be possible to work up a questionnaire on which short one-check answers could be made. This would eliminate one fault found with this questionnaire by the men who answered it - its great length and the fatiguing job required to fill it out completely and honestly. Although an original open-end answer~~s~~ covers a full page, it must be coded into a short idea of two or three words for tabulation on the IBM machines; it would seem unnecessary, therefore, to ask for full explanations or descriptions as was done on this questionnaire, especially if one person must do the coding alone. Naturally, since this was presumably the first survey on this subject, it was not known what possible answers could be given so that prepared answers for checking were out of the question. Since general areas of responses can now be foreseen from the type of answers given on this questionnaire, little difficulty should be encountered in working up an answer selection type of questionnaire.

Now that results are in, it is a simple matter to look back and see the mistakes which were made along the way. This survey may have one benefit, however, and that is in helping any future researcher who may care to probe more deeply into the questions which were raised to avoid the same errors which have already been made. It may also point out new problems for study and give a new slant to old ones. If it can do these things, this project may well be deemed a complete success.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, G.W., Gillespie, J.M., & Young, J. The religion of the post-war college student. J. Psychol., 1948, 25, 3-33.
2. Crespi, L P., & Shapleigh, G.S. The veteran - a myth. Pub. Opin. Quar., 1946, 10, 361-372.
3. Kennedy, R.C. How good were the army chaplains? Christ. Cent., 1946, 63, 716-717.
4. Wittels, D. G. Are the chaplains doing a job? Sat. Eve. Post, 1944, 217, 12-13.

THE ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE VETERANS  
IN RELATION TO CHAPLAINS IN SERVICE

Below are a few questions about your attitudes as related to chaplains in service. We are interested in your opinions, not your identity. Please answer the questions as fully as you can.

1. From your experience in the service, what in general is your opinion of the work of the chaplains - favorable or unfavorable - and why?
- |                             |   |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Generally favorable .....   | ( | ) | 1 |
| Generally unfavorable ..... | ( | ) | 2 |
| No opinion .....            | ( | ) | 3 |

Comment in detail:

2. How frequently, if ever, during your period in service did you consult with a chaplain on any of your problems?
- |                     |   |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Frequently .....    | ( | ) | 1 |
| Occasionally .....  | ( | ) | 2 |
| Once or twice ..... | ( | ) | 3 |
| Never .....         | ( | ) | 4 |

- a) If you consulted any chaplain, he was generally of what faith?
- |                  |   |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|---|
| Catholic .....   | ( | ) | 1 |
| Protestant ..... | ( | ) | 2 |
| Jewish .....     | ( | ) | 3 |
| Don't know ..... | ( | ) | 4 |

- b) In general do you feel that the counseling you received was adequate? Comment.
- |               |   |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|---|
| Yes .....     | ( | ) | 1 |
| No .....      | ( | ) | 2 |
| No opinion .. | ( | ) | 3 |

3. For advice in the personal problems you encountered in service would you rather have gone to a chaplain or to a person like a psychologist?
- |                    |   |   |   |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Chaplain .....     | ( | ) | 1 |
| Other person ..... | ( | ) | 2 |
| No opinion .....   | ( | ) | 3 |

Why do you have this preference? Please answer in detail.

From your observations of chaplains do you feel that their counsel to service men in regard to their personal problems was realistic or unrealistic in the main as you understand those terms.

Realistic .....	(	)	1
Unrealistic .....	(	)	2
No opinion .....	(	)	3

Please explain:

5. During your period in service have you heard any sermons that were given by chaplains?
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| Yes ..... | ( | ) | 1 |
| No .....  | ( | ) | 2 |

If yes, what briefly is your evaluation of those sermons?

6. Considering specifically your experiences with chaplains during your period in service, do you think that your contacts resulted in your being
- |                                       |   |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| More religious .....                  | ( | ) | 1 |
| Less religious .....                  | ( | ) | 2 |
| Unaffected one way or the other ..... | ( | ) | 3 |
| No experience with chaplains ..       | ( | ) | 4 |

Why, briefly?

7. Chaplains often gave talks on sex and morals to the command; did you ever hear any of these talks?
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| Yes ..... | ( | ) | 1 |
| No .....  | ( | ) | 2 |

If yes, do you feel that the chaplain dealt adequately with the problems involved?

Yes .....	(	)	1
No .....	(	)	2
No opinion ..	(	)	3

Comment briefly.



8. From your observations of chaplains of different faiths during your period in service, do you think that their actions in regards to one another tended to foster religious unity or religious differences?
- |                                      |     |   |
|--------------------------------------|-----|---|
| Fostered religious unity .....       | ( ) | 1 |
| Fostered religious differences ..... | ( ) | 2 |
| No opinion .....                     | ( ) | 3 |

Explain:

9. In the Navy the chaplain was generally placed in charge of recreational functions. Do you think this is a good idea?
- |                       |     |   |
|-----------------------|-----|---|
| Good idea .....       | ( ) | 1 |
| Not a good idea ..... | ( ) | 2 |
| No opinion .....      | ( ) | 3 |

Why? Please answer in detail here.

10. From your experiences with chaplains during the war, how do you feel their morale stood up under dangerous conditions?
- |  |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
| About the same as the average soldier .....                    | ( ) | 1 |
| Better than the average soldier .....                          | ( ) | 2 |
| Not as well as the average soldier .....                       | ( ) | 3 |
| No experiences with chaplains under dangerous conditions ..... | ( ) | 4 |
| No opinion .....   | ( ) | 5 |

Comment briefly.

11. What effects, if any, do you think that the fact that the chaplain was an officer had upon his relationships with enlisted men?

12. From your experience, would you say that the chaplains of any one faith (Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish) appeared to be more able than the chaplains of any other?

Yes..... ( ) 1  
No ..... ( ) 2  
No opinion . ( ) 3

if yes,

a) Which do you consider more able?

Catholic ... ( ) 1  
Protestant.. ( ) 2  
Jewish ..... ( ) 3

b) Why do you consider this to be true?

13. It has been said: "The effectiveness of the chaplain is far more closely related to his personality and his ability to win the affection of his men than to the per se fact that he is an ordained man of God" ---  
Comment briefly on this statement.

14. Generally speaking, what level of personnel do you think went into the chaplaincy during the war?

Persons superior to the general run of ministers and priests ..... ( ) 1  
Persons inferior to the general run of ministers and priests ..... ( ) 2  
Persons about the same as the general run of ministers and priests ..... ( ) 3  
No opinion ..... ( ) 4

Comment.

15. Considering in your own estimation the strong points and weak points of the work of the chaplains during the war, what would be your recommendations as to how their training might be improved?

Though we are not interested in who you are, certain information about background characteristics is needed to analyze the data. Will you please answer the following questions by making a check mark to the right of the appropriate answers.

1. What is your religious affiliation?

Catholic ..... ( ) 1  
 Protestant ... ( ) 2  
 Jewish ..... ( ) 3  
 Other ..... ( ) 4  
 None ..... ( ) 5

2. If other than Catholic, name below your sect, type, or point of view.

-----  
 3. Indicate by one of the categories below how strongly religious you are in your estimation.

Very strongly ..... ( ) 1  
 Strongly ..... ( ) 2  
 Moderately ..... ( ) 3  
 Not very strongly ..... ( ) 4  
 Not at all strongly ..... ( ) 5

4. With reference to your military service, check below those categories into which you fall.

a) Officer ..... ( ) 1  
 Enlisted man ..... ( ) 2  
 b) Army ..... ( ) 1  
 Navy ..... ( ) 2  
 Marine Corps ..... ( ) 3  
 Coast Guard ..... ( ) 4  
 Air Forces ..... ( ) 5  
 c) Combat ..... ( ) 1  
 No combat ..... ( ) 2  
 d) Overseas service ..... ( ) 1  
 U. S. A. service only ..... ( ) 2

5. Check your age below.

20 and under ..... ( ) 1  
 21 through 24 ..... ( ) 2  
 25 and over ..... ( ) 3

6. What would you term your area of greatest scholastic interest and competence?

Physical sciences (including  
 Mathematics and Engineering) ..... ( ) 1  
 Biological sciences ..... ( ) 2  
 Social sciences ..... ( ) 3  
 Humanities ..... ( ) 4  
 Languages ..... ( ) 5

7. Write below your current or anticipated field of study.

-----  
 8. What is your status in the University?

1st term Freshman ..... ( ) 1  
 2nd term Freshman ..... ( ) 2  
 1st term Sophomore ..... ( ) 3  
 2nd term Sophomore ..... ( ) 4  
 1st term Junior ..... ( ) 5  
 2nd term Junior ..... ( ) 6  
 1st term Senior ..... ( ) 7  
 2nd term Senior ..... ( ) 8

9. What was your group average last term?

First Group ..... ( ) 1  
 Second Group ..... ( ) 2  
 Third Group ..... ( ) 3  
 Fourth Group ..... ( ) 4  
 Fifth Group ..... ( ) 5

10. What is your marriage status?

Married ..... ( ) 1  
 Single ..... ( ) 2  
 Engaged ..... ( ) 3

## APPENDIX I

4. From your observations of chaplains do you feel that their counsel to service men in regard to their personal problems was realistic or unrealistic in the main as you understand those terms.

Realistic ..... ( ) 1  
Unrealistic ..... ( ) 2  
No opinion ..... ( ) 3

Please explain:

5. During your period in service have you heard any sermons that were given by chaplains?

Yes ..... ( ) 1  
No ..... ( ) 2

If yes, what briefly is your evaluation of these sermons?

6. Considering specifically your experiences with chaplains during your period in service, do you think that your contacts resulted in your being

More religious ..... ( ) 1  
Less religious ..... ( ) 2  
Unaffected one way or other ( ) 3  
No experience with chaplains. ( ) 4

Why, briefly?

7. Chaplains often gave talks on sex and morals to the command; did you ever hear any of these talks?

Yes..... ( ) 1  
No ..... ( ) 2

If yes, do you feel that the chaplain dealt adequately with the problems involved?

Yes ..... ( ) 1  
No ..... ( ) 2

If yes, do you feel that the chaplain dealt adequately with the problems involved?

Yes..... ( ) 1  
No ..... ( ) 2  
No opinion ( ) 3

Comment briefly.

6. From your observations of chaplains of different faiths during your period in service, do you think that their actions in regards to one another tended to foster religious unity or religious differences?

Fostered religious unity ..... ( ) 1  
 Fostered religious differences .. ( ) 2  
 No opinion ..... ( ) 3

Explain:

9. In the Navy the chaplain was generally placed in charge of recreational functions. Do you think this is a good idea?

Good idea..... ( ) 1  
 Not a good idea ..... ( ) 2  
 No opinion ..... ( ) 3

Why? Please answer in detail here.

10. From your experiences with chaplains during the war, how do you feel their morale stood up under dangerous conditions?

About the same as the average soldier..... ( ) 1  
 Better than the average soldier ..... ( ) 2  
 Not as well as the average soldier ..... ( ) 3  
 No experiences with chaplains under dangerous conditions . ( ) 4  
 No opinion ..... ( ) 5

Comment briefly.

11. What effects, if any, do you think that the fact that the chaplain was an officer had upon his relationships with enlisted men?

12. From your experience, would you say that the chaplains of any one faith (Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish) appeared to be more able than the chaplains of any other?

Yes ..... ( ) 1  
No ..... ( ) 2  
No opinion ..... ( ) 3

if yes,

- a) Which do you consider more able?

Catholic..... ( ) 1  
Protestant ..... ( ) 2  
Jewish ..... ( ) 3

- b) Why do you consider this to be true?

13. It has been said: "The effectiveness of the chaplain is far more closely related to his personality and his ability to win the affection of his men than to the per se fact that he is an ordained man of God" --  
Comment briefly on this statement.

14. Generally speaking, what level of personnel do you think went into the chaplaincy during the war?

Persons superior to the general run of  
ministers and priests ..... ( ) 1  
Persons inferior to the general run of  
ministers and priests ..... ( ) 2  
Persons about the same as the general  
run of ministers and priests ..... ( ) 3  
No opinion ..... ( ) 4

Comment.



15. Considering in your own estimation the strong points and weak points of the work of the chaplains during the war, what would be your recommendations as to how their training might be improved?

# BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Though we are not interested in who you are, certain information about background characteristics is needed to analyze the data. Will you please answer the following questions by making a check mark to the right of the appropriate answers.

1. What is your religious affiliation?

Catholic ..... ( ) 1  
 Protestant ..... ( ) 2  
 Jewish ..... ( ) 3  
 Other ..... ( ) 4  
 None ..... ( ) 5

2. If other than Catholic, name below your sect, type, or point of view.

-----

3. Indicate by one of the categories below how strongly religious you are in your estimation.

Very strongly ..... ( ) 1  
 Strongly ..... ( ) 2  
 Moderately ..... ( ) 3  
 Not very strongly ..... ( ) 4  
 Not at all strongly ..... ( ) 5

4. With reference to your military service, check below those categories into which you fall.

a) Officer ..... ( ) 1  
 Enlisted man ..... ( ) 2  
  
 b) Army ..... ( ) 1  
 Navy ..... ( ) 2  
 Marine Corps ..... ( ) 3  
 Coast Guard ..... ( ) 4  
 Air Forces ..... ( ) 5  
  
 c) Combat ..... ( ) 1  
 No combat ..... ( ) 2  
  
 d) Overseas service ..... ( ) 1  
 U.S.A. service only ..... ( ) 2

5. Check your age below.

20 and under ..... ( ) 1  
 21 through 24 ..... ( ) 2  
 25 and over ..... ( ) 3

6. What would you term your area of greatest scholastic interest and competence?

Physical sciences (including  
 Mathematics and Engineering) ..... ( ) 1  
 Biological sciences ..... ( ) 2  
 Social sciences ..... ( ) 3  
 Humanities ..... ( ) 4  
 Languages ..... ( ) 5

7. Write below your current or anticipated field of study.

-----

# BACKGROUND INFORMATION (continued)

8. What is your status in the University?

1st term Freshman .....	( )	1
2nd term Freshman .....	( )	2
1st term Sophomore .....	( )	3
2nd term Sophomore .....	( )	4
1st term Junior .....	( )	5
2nd term Junior .....	( )	6
1st term Senior .....	( )	7
2nd term Senior .....	( )	8

9. What was your group average last term?

First Group.....	( )	1
Second Group .....	( )	2
Third Group .....	( )	3
Fourth Group .....	( )	4
Fifth Group .....	( )	5

10. What is your marriage status?

Married .....	( )	1
Single .....	( )	2
Engaged .....	( )	3